

## Armenian Miscellanea

ERIC P. HAMP  
University of Chicago

### eresk<sup>c</sup>

The genitive is eresac<sup>c</sup>; therefore the final of this plurale tantum should be \*-kā.<sup>1</sup> If we are to equate this noun with Greek πρόσωπα,<sup>2</sup> we shall need to derive er- from \*proti-. If the formation is that of other nouns for 'face,' the portion following the first element should be \*-H<sub>o</sub>k"- (akn).

A sequence \*proti-H<sub>o</sub>k"-iķā, could give \*protik"-iķā > \*φroiihiša- > \*roiiisa-. This does not promise to yield eresa-. If we resyllabify \*protiH<sub>o</sub>k"-iķā, then we get \*proti(i)ək"-iķā > \*φroijihisā- > \*roiajisa-. Again, this not promising. If \*φroijihisā- had suffered a kind of haplology, eliminating oi, we would have \*φrijahiša-; this leads to \*ria(j)isa- > \*erea(y)sa- > eresa-.

Then the shorter form eres-k<sup>c</sup> was vocalized by analogy with the penult vocalism of eresa-.

## FOOTNOTES

<sup>1</sup>See "The semantics of Armenian plurals." From *Soundstream to Discourse* (Papers from the 1971 Mid-America Linguistics Conference), Columbia, Missouri, 1972, 66-71.

<sup>2</sup>BSL 68, 1973, 77ff.

### aseln

Since the l-stems remain alive in Armenian, we cannot have here a frozen ācc. sg. The formation then suggests an old heteroclite. The vocalism -eł- suggests a non-neuter, and Greek κρος

which cannot be a participial \*-ró- suggests a replacement of a moribund animate, shifted to the surviving, \*r/n heteroclites; the n-state of the stem is furnished by Ved. aśáni-h = Lith. ašnìs. We recover, then, \*asel/asn- < \*ak-el/n-, parallel in formation to 'sun'.<sup>1</sup>

## FOOTNOTE

<sup>1</sup>Bulletin of the Board of Celtic Studies 26, 1975, 97-102.

### varem, varim

The base varí- 'kindle, burn' cannot be directly equated with Lith. virti, OCS. vréti variti etc.<sup>1</sup>, since it is clear that the regular reflex for simple initial IE \*y is Armenian g<sup>2</sup>. A reflex transcribed v, w must result from some kind of internal (medial) treatment. I have already suggested a solution along these lines for vec<sup>c</sup> '6'.<sup>3</sup>

Meillet (Esquisse 50) has already proposed \*(u)wer < \*uper for ger i veroy. We may profitably follow that up, along lines of Schmitt Grammatik 76 § 12 X and 189.

Various related forms,<sup>4</sup> including Greek φύειν, show us that IE had a particle base \*up-, or \*hup- as I would reconstruct it taking into account the Albanian evidence. We therefore propose a compound verb \*hup + ur-ne- (κάμνω) 'heat completely, vel sim.' [hup-ur-ne-]. By the IE rule deleting y after labial obstruent, this becomes \*(h)upgne- > \*uwarne- > waře-. The \*r was originally strengthened to ř next to \*n. If then the trans. \*-ur-ne- > \*uwarne- > \*vařnem and the intrans. \*-ur-ě- > \*uwari- > \*varim lived side by side, the pair was plausibly leveled to var- with the distinction carried by e : i. The form is too isolated to enable us to say whether the \*u- was lost phonetically or by aphaeresis, since the syntactic collocations of \*(en+)upéri and \*upgne were not identical.

## FOOTNOTES

<sup>1</sup>See most recently R. Schmitt, Grammatik des Klassisch-Armenischen, Innsbruck, 1981, p. 70; Kratylos 17, 1972 (1974), 26. Dumézil's suggestion of \*v- + ař- does not really explain, but is on the right track.

<sup>2</sup>See, e.g., J.A.C. Greppin. *AAL* 2, 1981, 3.

<sup>3</sup>Linguistic and Literary Studies in Honor of Archibald A. Hill, The Hague: Mouton, 1978, vol. III 81-90.

<sup>4</sup>See *Studia Celtica* 14-15, 1979-80, 106-13, esp. 109 for \*ups-.

## Locative yamsean

Godel (106 § 5.237) thinks that the locative y-amsean is an “extended form of -i,” originating with -st, e.g., in korust gen.-dat.-loc. korsteān “loss.” But amis (and cnund) have no i forms and are o-stems. Such a form must be explained as a (partial) relic.

We must regard amis amsoy as an old neuter or masculine s-stem (cf. Baltic *mēnes-*), for which we reconstruct the pre-form \*sm-mēns-os ‘single-moon’; for the construction cf. Proceedings of the 11th International Congress of Linguists, Bologna 1975, II 1047-55, esp. 1050 footnote 14.

This locative must then be \*sm-mēns-es-η-i > \*am-mis-e-an(-i) > amsean. Such a case form must have arisen through the conflation of two stem forms. In the older endingless locative we would have had \*sm-mēns-es × \*sm-mēns-en > \*sm-mēns-esen → \*-esn-i.

## ənd, ənto-cin

This ambiguous preposition may well have multiple sources. Schmitt Grammatik 165-6 opts for \*en-tos, and this is highly likely because it agrees specifically with Greek *ἐντός*. Unless however we can assume a rule for proclitic vowel reduction, a source directly in \*anti is not possible, in view of my argument<sup>1</sup> for and ‘illic’ from \*an + te < \*H<sub>a</sub>en to-. Note that normal “pretonic” reduction is not proclitic.

Another possible source is \*en-dhi, the equivalent of the ancient locative \*en-i.<sup>2</sup> In view of the survival of -j = Greek -θι in Armenian, such a formation is as likely as \*en-tos.

A closely related but distinct formation ənto-cin has been perceptively analyzed<sup>3</sup> by J. Weitenberg. He correctly identifies the initial element as \*endV-, equating it with Greek *ἐνδον*. I would

equate the two exactly as \*en-do, explaining the Greek as containing *n-ephelkystikón* and thereby attracted to the paradigm of δῶ (= Arm. tun).<sup>4</sup> An interesting Celtic analogue to ἡτο-*cin* is found in Welsh *anian, annyan* ‘nature.’<sup>5</sup>

It seems that Armenian continues traces of \*H<sub>e</sub>en (> i), \*H<sub>e</sub>en-tos, \*H<sub>e</sub>en-dhi, and \*H<sub>e</sub>en-do.

## FOOTNOTES

<sup>1</sup>Papers in Honor of Madison S. Beeler, edd. K. Klar, M. Langdon, and S. Silver (The Hague: Mouton) 1980, 343.

<sup>2</sup>See my analysis of this group, *Eriu* 28, 1977, 145-6.

<sup>3</sup>Annual of Armenian Linguistics 2, 1981, 85-9.

<sup>4</sup>See my analysis *Lingua Posnaniensis* 20, 1977, 11 footnote 4, and *Zeitschrift für celtische Philologie* 36, 1977, 9.

<sup>5</sup>I have analyzed this in *Bulletin of the Board of Celtic Studies* 16, 1956, 279-80.

## cnund

The recoverable paradigm of this noun must be \*ǵénont- ≈ \*ǵénont-es-n- vel sim. (see *amis*); pl. \*ǵénont-es, acc. \*ǵénont-()ns, gen. \*ǵénont-o-skō-, instr. \*ǵénont-o-bhVs. Alternatively, instead of \*ǵénont-es-n- we may have \*ǵénont-ia-n-. So much for the phonetics.

Morphologically, the plural \*ǵénont- immediately suggests the type of γέρων. The combining form of \*ǵénonto-skō- and \*-bhVs matches γεροντο-(διδάσκαλος). This all suggests that we should choose for the pre-form of the singular an old abstract \*ǵénont-ia-(n-), which may be compared indirectly with γεροντία. Such an abstract-collective gives the nom-acc. \*ǵénont-i > cnund, oblique \*ǵénont-iā-. The original derivation here was \*ǵenH<sub>e</sub>-ont-iH<sub>a</sub> to the middle verb *cnavim* < \*ǵenH<sub>e</sub>-n-(ē-)(> \*ǵen nē-).